OCCASSIONAL PAPER

2011, No. 3

CSSSC-UNICEF

Social Inclusion Cell

Fragmented Identities, Polarized Futures

Conceptualizing Caste as Social Exclusion

By

Prashant Negi

Dr. K. R. Narayanan Centre for Dalit & Minorities Studies
and Programme on Social Exclusion and Discrimination,
Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India

For Anjan

A brief candle; both ends burning

An endless mile; yet the wheels turning

So say it loud and let it ring

We are all a part of everything

The future, present and the past

Fly on proud bird

You're free at last

List of Acronyms

UN	United Nations
EU	European Union
DFID	Department for International Development
UK	United Kingdom
MMS	Mid-Day Meal Scheme
PDS	Public Distribution System
IIDS	Indian Institute of Dalit Studies
PSU	Public Sector Undertakings
SC	Scheduled Caste
ST	Scheduled Tribe
NEP	New Economic Policy

Fragmented Identities, Polarized Futures

Conceptualizing Caste as Social Exclusion

By

Prashant Negi[1]

1. Introduction

Caste, both in its traditional and modern form has remained a subject of intense academic inquiry. Much has been written on caste over the years. Lately, new forms of discourses have emerged under the rubric of 'social exclusion', which have extended the scope of academic discussion on caste. This paper attempts to contract with the following fundamental issues: how to juxtapose thinking on social exclusion to understanding caste in India? And will that analysis add any value to the existing discourses on caste?

Specifically, this paper integrates relevant themes from literature on social exclusion, wherein, the concept has been theoretically explored and attempts to apply the same towards understanding caste in India. Implicit here is the notion that some typology of social exclusion must be a 'constitutive' component and 'instrumentally' a cause of diverse capability failures and reduced life chances associated with caste-based discrimination. The purposes of inquiry, therefore, are to accentuate on the 'relational' dynamics of caste-based discrimination; to bring out the instrumental importance of caste-based exclusion; to investigate constitutively relevant relational aspects of caste-based discrimination; and to undertake an effectual analysis of the typology of exclusion. Also, the 'processes' and 'agencies' underlying caste-based discrimination have been looked into from the perspective of the interaction and mutual reinforcement of different dimensions of disadvantage, which incorporates the 'cultural devaluation' of people and groups and explains how inferiority is internalized. Further, the economic aspects of exclusion; creation of multidimensional disadvantage; and the dynamics of social exclusion in social provisioning are also ascertained.

[1] Prashant Negi is Assistant Professor, Dr. K. R. Narayanan Centre for Dalit & Minorities Studies and Programme on Social Exclusion and Discrimination, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India. He can be contacted at negiprashant@gmail.com

Thematically, these methodological issues are dealt with by firstly, presenting a brief background to the concept of social exclusion as articulated in contemporary and historical discourses. Secondly, the paper presents select empirical evidence on caste and untouchability-based discrimination to demonstrate marred 'access' and 'participation': key dimensions of social interaction and mobility; and finally, it explains the inferences drawn from these (empirical) studies with clarificatory remarks from the theory of social exclusion.

2. Understanding Social Exclusion

At the outset, it must be underscored that the elements of a unified theory of social exclusion are "contested" (Hills and others, 2002). Given the polysemic and superfluous nature of the term; it seems to be 'context specific' and continually redefined giving rise to its diffused connotations.

It, therefore, comes as no surprise that there are some who feel that the term social exclusion is merely re-labeling of what used to be called poverty (Barry, 2002) or even perhaps locate the term as being 'in search of a constituency' (Kabeer, 2000).

Nevertheless, the fact remains that social exclusion has made significant inroads into academic discussions and policy debates and is seen to be encompassing a wide range of topical issues – social, economic, political, as well as cultural. Also, the literature on the subject is growing exponentially and its study, as Sen puts it aptly, "is certainly not for the abstemious".

It must also be accentuated here that concepts are not mere translations of abstract thought; they always have a history, both in specific form and in relation to their precursors, and for concepts with political salience, that history is always contested. This is particularly true for social exclusion.

The mid-70s initiated a process of intense economic restructuring within the advanced capitalist democracies. As a consequence, new social problems emerged that appeared to challenge the very assumptions underlying the Western welfare states. Though, universal social welfare policies did insure against risks predictable from shared life cycle, career patterns and family

structures; a standardized life course could no longer be assumed. Such economic and social upheavals ushered in shifts in the 'moral imagination' giving us new conceptions of social disadvantage such as 'new poverty', 'underclass' and 'social exclusion' (Saith, 2001).

Modern usage of the term 'social exclusion' seems to have originated in France, even though it was in the practical context of identifying the excluded for policy purposes. The concept in that regard was first articulated by René Lenoir (1974) who as Secrétaire Etat a Action Sociale (Secretary for Social Action) of the French (Chirac) government postulated that 'Les Exclus' (the excluded or the outcastes) denote people who were administratively excluded by the state or from social protection. It may be emphasized here that governance in France draws upon the Republican tradition, wherein, prominence is given to the organic and solidaristic nature of society and the idea of the state as mirroring the general will of the nation. Exclusion in that regard denotes the rupture of a social bond (also cultural and moral bond) between the individual and society and is viewed as being subversive.

Thereupon, the list from which people may be excluded has significantly expanded. Silver (1995) noting "a few of the things that people maybe excluded from" spoke about:

> "a livelihood; secure, permanent employment; earnings; property, credit, or land; housing; minimal or prevailing consumption levels; education, skills, and cultural capital; the welfare state; citizenship and legal equality; democratic participation; public goods; the nation or the dominant race; family and sociability; humanity, respect, fulfillment and understanding."

The transferability of the concept of social exclusion is particularly predominant in Silver's conception. She sufficiently establishes that social exclusion has myriad usages and meanings, which in all probability explains the conceptualization of social exclusion in terms of poverty and capability deprivation by Smith, Townsend, Sen and De Hann; social closure by Weber, Parkin and Bourdieu ; conceptual spectrums of injustice by Kabeer; the idea of citizenship by Marshall and the idea of justice by Rawls to name a few. Given the paucity of space, a discussion on these aspects is beyond the scope of this paper.

Given the multitude of contexts, usages and meanings of social exclusion; it surely requires an extensive semantic definition. This has largely been conceded by multilateral organizations at the forefront of working on exclusion/inclusion such as the UN; the EU; the Social Exclusion Task Force; and the DFID, UK. In fact, most of these organizations do not even wish to get enmeshed in definitional issues. For them, social exclusion as a concept presents itself as an extremely viable idea capable of facilitating multi-dimensional discourse and is extremely application oriented. An EU Commission (1992) document states and I quote "it is difficult to come up with a simple definition" [of social exclusion].

Also, sociological theorists suggest that "every attempt at establishing typology is inevitably reductionist, and all the more so in the cases of excluded population groups or those facing exclusion. The factors bringing about exclusion – whether originating in individual, family or socio-economic circumstances – are numerous, fluctuate and interact in such a way that, often they end up reinforcing each other." That is perhaps a reason enough why social exclusion is sometimes conceptually disaggregated as 'social' and 'exclusion'; for the simple reason that most forms of exclusion are legitimized or reinforced in a given social setting.

Also, since the concept is expressed in multiple terms such as poverty, destitution, deprivation, discrimination, dispossession, disaffiliation, multidimensional disadvantage, closure, marginality, inequality, distributive justice etc. then the logical question which emerges is how to define the concept? Perhaps the concept could be defined firstly, colloquially – so that it is used to define every form of social disadvantage. Secondly, analytically – wherein it is used to analyze social disadvantage (beyond poverty); thirdly, operationally – wherein it informs actions by institutional actors; and finally, in terms of outcomes and dynamic processes.

I agree, however, with Silver that social exclusion should be defined onomasiologically; that is, defining it with reference to more than one term. For the purposes of this paper, a working definition of social exclusion is borrowed from the DFID (2005), more so, as DFID is perhaps the only multilateral organization that officially recognizes caste as a form of social exclusion and also because it's thinking on social exclusion can be contextualized into the discussion. DFID defines social exclusion as "a process by which certain groups are systematically disadvantaged because they are discriminated against on the basis of their ethnicity, race,

religion, sexual orientation, caste, descent, gender, age, disability, HIV status, migrant status or where they live". It further states that "discrimination occurs in public institutions, such as the legal system or education and health services, as well as social institutions like the household".

Accordingly, social exclusion is conceptualized, on the one hand, as a condition or outcome, and, on the other, as a dynamic process. As a *condition* or *outcome*, social exclusion is a state in which excluded individuals or groups are unable to participate fully in their society. This may result from:

- their social identity (for instance race, gender, ethnicity, caste or religion), or
- social location (for instance in areas that are remote, stigmatised or suffering from war or conflict).

As *a multidimensional and dynamic process*, social exclusion refers to the social relations and organizational barriers that block the attainment of livelihoods, human development and equal citizenship. As a dynamic process, social exclusion is governed by:

- social and political relations; and
- access to organizations and institutional sites of power.

This conception of social exclusion has reasonable similitude' with the works of both Aristotle and Adam Smith. Aristotle maintained that "the richness of human life" was unequivocally linked to "the necessity to first ascertain the function of man", followed by an exploration of "life in the sense of activity". Smith correspondingly spoke about certain "necessaries" to lead non-poverished lives. He characterized such "necessaries" as being representative of the "ability to appear in public without shame". Accordingly, sufficient value may be placed upon not being excluded from societal interaction: a conception which is a constitutive feature of social exclusion as a dynamic process.

3. Empirical Evidence on Caste as Exclusion

3.1 The MMS and the PDS

This survey was conducted by IIDS (in 2007) in 531 villages within 30 districts across 05 states (Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Andhra Pradesh, and Tamil Nadu) of India in order to determine the treatment meted out to the Dalits in the MMS and the PDS schemes and also to establish whether the Dalits as a marginalized social group were being discriminated in the implementation of these schemes.

The survey was designed with an objective to ascertain:

1. The levels of physical access the Dalits had to these food security programs;
2. The degree to which they participated in their administration;
3. The nature of community-level access to each program;
4. To understand the locational dynamics of the MMS and the PDS centers; and finally
5. To understand the intangible behavioral aspects of discrimination and social exclusion in their implementation.

The MMS

Physical Access

If we consider the percentage of villages covered under this scheme as an indicator of access, we find that this scheme was implemented in 98.4 per cent of the villages surveyed. Similarly, while ascertaining the location of these centers, it was found that in a majority of the states, these centers were located in non-Dalit areas: the percentage being particularly low for the states of Rajasthan (12 per cent) and Tamil Nadu (19 per cent). By way of contrast, in Andhra Pradesh, 47 per cent of the centers were located in Dalit villages, thus, enabling the Dalits to have relatively easy access to them. The survey also established that in villages where mid-day meals were served in dominant caste localities, the variable and unpredictable caste relations did affect Dalit access to the meals, allowing the dominant castes to control access to the meals and making the Dalits more vulnerable. Conversely, when these centers were located in Dalit habitats, not only did the Dalits have better access, but children from other castes who wanted access to meals had to forego some of their caste-based prejudices.

Participatory Empowerment

The participatory empowerment of the Dalits in the MMS was ascertained by firstly, the percentage of mid-day meal centers operated by the Dalits themselves, and secondly, by the percentage of centers in which the Dalits were engaged or employed as cooks. The data indicated that Dalit participation was highest in Andhra Pradesh with 49 per cent of the respondent villages having Dalits as cooks and 45 per cent with Dalits as organizers. Tamil Nadu was next with 31 per cent of the villages having Dalit as cooks and 27 per cent as organizers. In Rajasthan, only 8 per cent of the villages surveyed had Dalit cooks and not even one village had a Dalit organizer for its mid-day meal center.

Community Access

The survey found that in 52 per cent of the villages in Rajasthan, 36 per cent of the villages in Tamil Nadu, and 24 per cent of the villages in Andhra Pradesh community-level access for the Dalits to the mid-day meals was restricted due to the presence of caste-based discrimination and exclusion. The forms and patterns of caste-based discrimination and exclusion included complete denial of meals to the Dalit children on account of "untouchability"; dominant caste opposition to the Dalit cooks in the scheme, which was perceptible in 48.3 per cent of the villages surveyed; the use of segregated or differential seating arrangements for the Dalit children during the meals, which was evident in 31 per cent of the villages; serving the Dalits separate meals altogether, which was noticed in 9.2 per cent of the villages; discrimination by the teachers who serve inadequate or pedestrian food to the Dalit children, which was observed in 9.2 per cent of the villages; and finally, some other problems, which were perceived in 2.3 per cent of the villages surveyed.

The narrative and qualitative accounts of caste discrimination in the MMS facilitated a comprehensive understanding of the patterns and specifics of caste discrimination and exclusion. For instance, in the case of opposition to Dalit cooks, the patterns of discrimination were found to be structured into the very process of constituting the scheme within a village. At the very inception stage of the scheme, the dominant caste members opposed the hiring of the Dalit

cooks. Then, if a Dalit cook was hired anyway, the dominant castes members forbid their children to eat the meals which those cooks had prepared. Their next step was to exert pressure on the administration to dismiss the services of the Dalit cook. If that too failed, they would then garner support to shut down the scheme in the village school. Finally, some dominant castes also reacted by withdrawing their wards from the school. Such instances were especially obvious in villages in the West Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh and in the Ajmer district of Rajasthan.

The PDS

With regard to the PDS scheme, 87 per cent of the villages surveyed were found to have at least one functioning PDS shop, while the remaining 13 per cent had none. Of the 05 states surveyed, access to PDS shops was lowest in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, wherein 39 per cent and 16 per cent of the villages surveyed had no PDS shops. Andhra Pradesh, on the other hand, seems to have adequately ensured access to PDS shops. Further, the survey also found that 70 per cent of the PDS shops in the entire sample of 531 villages were located in dominant caste localities, 17 per cent in Dalit localities, and 13 per cent elsewhere. Andhra Pradesh had the highest percentage of PDS shops in the Dalit colonies (30 per cent), while in Rajasthan not even a single village had a PDS shop in a Dalit locality.

The overwhelming preponderance of dominant caste PDS dealers (81 per cent) also conspicuously establishes the discriminatory levels of participatory empowerment and equity within this system. The forms of discrimination included discrimination in quantity (Dalits receiving smaller quantities for the same price); price (Dalits being charged more or extra for the same quantity of products); caste-based favoritism (Dalits being arbitrarily assigned “Dalit days,” often, once or twice in a week with reduced hours, preferential order of serving, and complete denial of PDS products etc.); and the practice of untouchability (goods not being distributed to Dalits until the dominant caste shop owners hung cloth screens in front of them to protect themselves from the Dalits polluting presence or alternatively, the goods being dropped from above into the cupped hands of Dalits so as to avoid any polluting contact with them).

3.2 Nature and Pattern of Atrocities on Dalits

To delineate the magnitude and pattern of atrocities against the Dalits, official statistics drawn from the Crime in India Report for the decadal period 1990 to 2000 were analyzed. The analysis indicated that a total of about 2,85,871 cases of various crimes were registered on an All India level by the Dalits, of which 14,030 were registered under the Anti-Untouchability Act and 81,796 under the Prevention of Atrocities Act. This means that on an average 28,587 cases of caste discrimination and atrocities were registered annually during the 1990's.

Drawing a typology on the nature of crime and atrocities, it came to the fore that on an average, 553 cases of murder, 2,990 of hurt; 919 of rape; 184 of kidnapping/abduction; 47 of dacoity; 127 of robbery; 456 of arson; 1,403 of caste discrimination; and 8,179 of atrocities were registered during the decadal period 1990 to 2000.

In 2000, 05 states comprising of Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh and Orissa accounted for the bulk of crimes and atrocities committed against the Dalits. In fact, of the above, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh together accounted for about 65 percent of crimes and atrocities.

In all, 10,0891 cases were still pending in the courts by the end of the year 2000 countrywide. Uttar Pradesh topped the list of pending cases with 74,303 followed by Maharashtra (8,212), Rajasthan (5,836), Orissa (5,669), Andhra Pradesh (1,845), Tamil Nadu (1.810), Karnataka (1,794) and Kerala (1,768). The analysis also established that the conviction rates for the perpetrators of atrocities were very low and conversely, the acquittal rates were very high.

3.3 Impact of the Reservation Policy on the Scheduled Castes – 1960-2003

This IIDS study examined the employment status of the SCs in the public sector in India, which includes central government services, PSUs, nationalized banks, and insurance sector for the period 1960 to 2003. The data was primarily drawn from various Government sources.

Central Government Services

Table 1 shows the representation of the SCs and the STs in various categories of Government

jobs. In 2003, the representation of the SCs in Group A, Group B, Group C, and Group D categories of jobs was 11.93, 14.32, 16.29, and 17.98 percentage points respectively. The corresponding figures for the General castes were 83.88 per cent in Group A jobs, followed by 81.36 per cent in Group B. Interestingly, their share in both, Group C and Group D jobs was lower at 77.17 and 75.06 percentage points.

Evidently, the representation of the SC and the ST employees in the Government jobs despite reservations fell much below the stipulated quotas especially in Group A and Group B categories of jobs.

The distribution of jobs within the SCs shows that out of every 100 jobs only 1.9 percent were employed in Group A, 4.8 percent in Group B, 64 percent in Group C and 29.3 percent in Group D jobs. Correspondingly, the percentage distribution of the General castes stood at 2.86 percent in Group A, 5.88 percent in Group B, 65.03 percent in Group C and 26.23 percent in Group D jobs respectively.

The analysis brought to the fore that the decline in Central Government jobs for the SCs was at a rate higher than that for the General castes. The analysis also established that the percentage share of the SCs fell much short of the stipulated quotas fixed under reservations by the Government and that their representation was higher in Group D category of jobs, which are considered lowly and polluted.

Further, the analysis accentuated that during the 1960s to the 1980s; more than half of the SC employees were concentrated in Group D category of jobs, while about 40 percent were concentrated in Group C category jobs respectively. The overall period under analysis (1960-2003) also suggests that while the absolute numbers, as well as the percentage share of the SCs in Group D jobs has decreased, it is nevertheless, followed by an increase in their representation in Group C jobs.

Employment in PSUs

In the PSUs, the representation of the SCs was found to have improved both in terms of absolute numbers and percentage share. However, a majority of the SCs were still found to be

concentrated in Group D followed by Group C categories of jobs. In Group A and Group B categories of jobs, the representation of the SCs was found to be unsatisfactory and at levels below the stipulated quotas. Further, the adverse impacts of the NEP were a visible in the PSU employment as both the absolute numbers and the percentage share of the SC and the ST employees declined after its inception in 1991 (see Table 2 for further details).

Employment in Public Sector Banks

Though, employment declined for all social groups after the inception of the NEP; its adverse impacts were more pronounced for the SCs than for the General castes. This too is evident from the data in Table 3.

Employment in Public Sector Insurance Companies

The analysis of employment in public sector insurance companies was limited by the non-availability of data before 1993 and after 2000. However, the available data did establish that employment for the SCs fell below the stipulated quota under reservations in Group A, Group B, and Group C categories of jobs. In terms of total employment, about 75 percent were concentrated in Group C jobs, while about 80 percent were concentrated in Group D jobs (see Table 4 for further details).

4. Caste Exclusion Explained

This section drawing upon the empirical studies elucidated in the paper attempts to understand some of the mechanisms that drive processes of social exclusion, by accentuating on the interaction and mutual reinforcement of different dimensions of disadvantage. For the same, the paper aligns with the theoretical conceptions of social exclusion by Kabeer (2006) and Sen (2000).

According to Kabeer, these mechanisms are: first, the cultural devaluation of groups and categories and the internalization of inferiority; second, the economic dynamics of social

exclusion; third, the intergenerational transmission of poverty; and fourth, the dynamics of exclusion in social provisioning.

First, the processes of cultural devaluation are key mechanisms through which the social exclusion of certain groups and categories by other dominant groups is perpetuated as a property of societal structures. These processes draw on beliefs, norms, and values to disparage, stereotype, invisibilise, ridicule, and demean 'despised' groups and categories and thereby, explain and justify the denial of full rights of participation in the economic, social, and political life of that society. While cultural disadvantage maybe primarily associated with despised identities, it is often, accompanied by economic discrimination: such groups are more likely to face difficulties in being employed and conversely, in retaining employment. The highly stratified Hindu social order based on the four-fold Varna system internalizes certain philosophical ideals within its religious fold – beliefs in the other world; reincarnation; karma theory etc. on the basis of which it assigns unequal and graded rights to the four Varna's. Interestingly, in the Varna system, the rights diminish as one goes down the hierarchy ladder. Also, ritual distancing between the Varna's is maintained by prohibition of inter-dining, marriage, social interaction etc., and also by the notion of 'purity-pollution relations' and 'untouchability'. As a result, the lowest Varna's constitute a 'culturally devalued' category facing immense exclusion based on their social (read caste) identity. Such philosophical beliefs being internalized into religion; justify and uphold the practice of the caste system and simultaneously, provide an exegetical explanation of the peripheral status of the lower Varna's. Such processes can have profound effects on the sense of 'self-worth' and 'sense of agency' of those who are treated in this way and on the terms on which they are able to access the resources and opportunities in different spheres of their society.

Second, juxtaposed between the economic and cultural forms of injustice are 'hybrid forms' of injustice, which give rise to 'bivalent collectivities': social groups suffering from both, economic and cultural-valuational disadvantage. Gender, race, caste, ethnicity and religion are instances of bivalent collectivities. Different forms of injustice have their own logic and strategic responses. In case of the disadvantage being economic, disadvantaged groups are likely to mobilize around their interests and to formulate their demands in terms of redistribution. Where disadvantage is largely cultural-valuational, the disadvantaged mobilize around the question of identity and

demands are formulated in terms of recognition. Where disadvantage is hybrid, mobilization encompasses material interests and social identity and demands are formulated in terms of redistribution and recognition.

Third, the economic dynamics of poverty among excluded groups are mediated by the processes of cultural devaluation mentioned above. Economic conceptualizations of injustice according to Kabeer range from exploitation (that is appropriation of labour), marginalization (that is exclusion from the means of livelihood or confinement to poorly paid, undesirable forms of work) to deprivation (that is being denied an adequate standard of living). Amartya Sen, in this context, feels that though deprivation may be to a large extent incumbent upon income, but it is not the single causative influence on the lives that we lead. If we are essentially interested in the kind of lives people can lead; then the freedom to do so and the means to such freedom becomes essential. The concept of social exclusion allows the phenomenon of interest to extend beyond non-participation due to lack of material resources. Its measures not only identify those who lack resources, but simultaneously, also those whose non-participation arises in multiple ways – though discrimination, chronic ill health, cultural identifications, geographical locations, etc. By culturally assigning the excluded groups to low paid and demeaning occupations: the caste system excludes lowest caste groups from ownership of land and key productive assets and relegates them to various forms of labour and services that are considered menial, degrading, and dirty; economic exclusion as a corollary is mediated by the higher caste groups. Herein, the notions of 'favourable exclusion' and 'unfavourable inclusion' as developed by Sen become important: certain categories of occupations such as Group D categories of jobs or scavenging are considered to be polluting; the higher Varna's despite being unemployed would 'favourably exclude' themselves from such occupations, while 'unfavourably including' the lower Varna's in such occupations. Though, the Varna system includes the lower castes, the 'terms' of their inclusion and the 'fairness of treatment' meted to them constitute the problematique.

Fourth, the ascribed status of excluded groups and occupations is one of the instruments through, which poverty is transmitted over generations. Further, limitations on the prospects of occupational mobility are reinforced by a process of circumscribing parental aspirations. Also, the ascribed status of occupations ensures that the progeny inherits restricted life options. This form of social exclusion has also been explained in greater detail by Hills et al who

conceptualize social exclusion in terms ‘past’ and ‘present’ capital. Capital accordingly has been characterized as cultural, physical and human.

Finally, the economic vulnerability of excluded groups is buttressed by biased provisioning of basic services, which could in essence improve their life chances (the work of A. R. Desai on the dimensions of rural untouchability and more recently the book *Dalits in India: In Search for Common Destiny* adequately establishes this dimension). Concomitant to uneven availability of services runs direct provider discrimination. This aspect has also been unequivocally demonstrated from the studies mentioned in the preceding section.

Table 1, Percentage Share of the Social Groups to the Total Employees in Government Jobs by Categories (Excluding Sweepers)

	Group A					Group B				Group C			Group D			
Yr.	SC	ST	GEN	T	SC	ST	GEN	T	SC	ST	GEN	T	SC	ST	GEN	T
1965	1.64	0.27	97.59	100	2.82	0.34	96.56	100	8.88	1.14	89.71	100	17.75	3.50	78.82	100
1968	2.11	0.59	97.30	100	3.11	0.41	96.48	100	9.22	0.13	90.65	100	18.32	3.61	78.08	100
1971	2.58	0.41	97.01	100	4.06	0.43	95.51	100	9.59	1.67	88.74	100	18.37	3.65	77.98	100
1972	2.99	0.50	96.52	100	4.13	0.44	95.43	100	9.77	1.72	88.52	100	18.61	3.82	77.57	100
1973	3.14	0.50	96.36	100	4.51	0.49	95.00	100	10.05	1.95	87.99	100	18.37	3.92	77.70	100
1974	3.25	0.57	96.18	100	4.59	0.49	94.92	100	10.33	2.13	87.54	100	18.53	3.84	77.64	100
1975	3.43	0.62	95.95	100	4.98	0.59	94.43	100	10.71	2.27	87.02	100	18.64	3.99	77.37	100
1981	5.46	1.12	93.42	100	8.42	1.31	90.28	100	12.95	3.16	83.90	100	19.35	5.07	75.57	100

1982	5.49	1.17	93.34	100	9.02	1.43	89.55	100	13.39	3.47	83.14	100	23.41	7.45	69.14	100
1984	6.92	1.70	91.38	100	10.36	1.77	87.87	100	13.98	3.79	82.23	100	20.20	6.04	73.77	100
1985	7.65	1.73	90.62	100	10.04	1.58	88.39	100	14.88	4.20	80.92	100	20.81	5.70	73.49	100
1987	8.23	2.05	89.72	100	10.41	1.92	87.67	100	14.45	4.23	81.32	100	20.04	5.84	74.12	100
1988	8.67	2.30	89.04	100	11.18	2.10	86.72	100	14.80	4.48	80.72	100	19.88	6.10	74.02	100
1989	8.51	2.24	89.25	100	11.65	2.00	86.35	100	14.85	4.52	80.63	100	20.41	6.46	73.13	100
1990	8.64	2.58	88.78	100	11.29	2.39	86.32	100	15.19	4.83	79.98	100	21.48	6.73	71.79	100
1991	9.09	2.53	88.37	100	11.82	2.35	85.83	100	15.65	4.98	79.36	100	21.24	6.82	71.94	100
1992	9.67	2.92	87.40	100	11.57	2.38	86.05	100	15.74	3.16	81.10	100	20.88	6.75	72.37	100
1993	9.80	3.06	87.13	100	12.17	2.35	85.48	100	15.91	5.43	78.66	100	20.73	6.87	72.39	100
1994	10.24	2.93	86.83	100	12.06	2.81	85.13	100	15.74	5.38	78.88	100	20.47	6.15	73.38	100
1995	10.15	2.89	86.96	100	12.67	2.68	84.65	100	16.15	5.69	78.16	100	20.53	6.48	72.99	100
1996	11.51	3.57	84.93	100	12.30	2.81	84.89	100	15.45	5.65	78.90	100	20.27	6.07	73.67	100
1997	10.74	3.23	86.03	100	12.90	3.04	84.05	100	16.20	6.16	77.65	100	24.06	6.73	69.21	100
1998	10.80	3.44	85.76	100	12.35	3.02	84.63	100	16.32	6.01	77.67	100	18.65	6.95	74.40	100
199	11.2	3.3	85.3	10	12.6	3.3	83.9	10	15.7	6.0	78.1	10	20.0	7.0	73.0	10

9	9	9	2	0	8	5	8	0	8	7	5	0	0	0	0	0
2000	10.97	3.48	85.55	100	12.54	3.09	84.37	100	15.88	6.33	77.79	100	17.38	6.66	75.95	100
2001	11.42	3.58	85.00	100	12.82	3.70	83.48	100	16.25	6.46	77.29	100	17.89	6.81	75.30	100
2002	11.09	3.97	84.94	100	14.08	4.18	81.74	100	16.12	5.93	77.94	100	20.07	7.13	72.80	100
2003	**11.93**	4.18	**83.88**	100	**14.32**	4.32	**81.36**	100	**16.29**	6.54	**77.17**	100	**17.98**	6.96	**75.06**	100

Note:

Yr. Year
SC Scheduled Caste
ST Scheduled Tribe
GEN General Castes
T Total

Source: Computed from the data provided in the Annual Report, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, Government of India, New Delhi, 1985-1986, 1989-1990, and 2004-2005.

Table 2, Percentage Share of the Social Groups to the Total Employees in PSUs by Categories (Excluding Sweepers)

On Jan 1	Group A				Group B				Group C				Group D			
Yr.	SC	ST	GEN	T	SC	ST	GEN	T	SC	ST	GEN	T	SC	ST	GEN	T
1971	0.52	0.17	99.31	100	1.54	0.16	98.30	100	5.49	1.29	93.22	100	15.96	5.94	78.09	100
1972	0.68	0.15	99.17	100	1.84	0.19	97.97	100	8.11	2.20	89.69	100	17.63	7.39	74.98	100
1973	0.95	0.24	98.82	100	2.53	0.28	97.19	100	9.01	2.84	88.15	100	24.50	8.26	67.24	100
1974	1.19	0.26	98.55	100	2.96	0.41	96.63	100	13.18	6.30	80.52	100	26.70	11.69	61.61	100
1975	1.44	0.30	98.26	100	3.02	0.42	96.56	100	13.73	5.97	80.29	100	26.29	11.93	61.78	100
1976	1.68	0.36	97.96	100	3.19	0.54	96.27	100	16.37	8.22	75.41	100	24.14	13.67	62.18	100
1977	1.81	0.43	97.76	100	3.09	0.55	96.36	100	16.76	7.68	75.56	100	22.53	10.32	67.15	100
1978	2.03	0.47	97.51	100	3.68	0.91	95.41	100	16.30	7.41	76.29	100	22.85	10.51	66.64	100
1979	2.29	0.53	97.19	100	4.15	0.96	94.89	100	16.98	7.87	75.15	100	22.44	9.93	67.63	100
1980	2.90	0.66	96.44	100	5.12	1.36	93.52	100	18.08	7.71	74.20	100	22.36	10.76	66.88	100
1981	3.18	0.69	96.13	100	6.12	1.52	92.36	100	18.15	7.92	73.94	100	20.89	11.29	67.82	100

1982	3.58	0.88	95.54	100	6.58	1.87	91.54	100	17.80	8.47	73.72	100	22.28	12.40	65.32	100
1983	3.69	0.87	95.44	100	6.58	1.93	91.49	100	17.83	8.57	73.60	100	22.34	12.47	65.18	100
1984	3.93	0.89	95.18	100	5.38	1.60	93.02	100	18.23	8.65	73.13	100	27.37	15.13	57.50	100
1985	4.12	0.89	94.98	100	5.51	1.57	92.92	100	18.34	8.62	73.04	100	27.21	15.13	57.66	100
1986	4.58	1.00	94.42	100	6.09	1.59	92.32	100	18.50	8.76	72.73	100	30.75	17.00	52.24	100
1987	4.86	1.18	93.97	100	6.17	1.55	92.28	100	18.54	8.82	72.63	100	30.83	17.07	52.10	100
1988	5.32	1.17	93.50	100	7.00	2.09	90.91	100	19.04	8.90	72.06	100	31.13	19.48	49.39	100
1989	5.76	1.29	92.95	100	8.41	2.31	89.28	100	19.19	8.88	71.93	100	31.36	19.73	48.90	100
1990	5.95	1.43	92.61	100	8.73	2.51	88.76	100	19.20	8.95	71.85	100	31.39	19.82	48.79	100
1991	6.41	1.55	92.05	100	9.05	2.53	88.42	100	19.20	9.02	71.78	100	30.79	19.73	49.48	100
1992	6.69	1.66	91.65	100	9.22	2.95	87.83	100	16.82	8.13	75.05	100	23.25	9.71	67.05	100
1993	7.37	1.88	90.75	100	9.12	3.37	87.51	100	18.71	8.42	72.87	100	21.90	9.76	68.34	100
1994	7.80	1.88	90.32	100	9.54	3.30	87.15	100	17.97	8.95	73.08	100	23.84	9.85	66.32	100
1995	8.19	2.17	89.64	100	9.50	3.30	87.20	100	18.95	8.72	72.32	100	22.58	9.85	67.57	100
1996	8.41	2.27	89.32	100	9.68	3.52	86.80	100	19.14	8.72	72.14	100	22.41	10.68	66.92	100
1997	9.2	2.	88.	10	10.	3.	85.	10	18.	8.	72.	10	22.	10.	66.	10

	0	50	31	0	40	70	90	0	98	62	40	0	61	82	57	0
1998	9.56	2.62	87.82	100	10.53	3.88	85.58	100	18.97	8.47	72.55	100	22.57	10.86	66.57	100
1999	10.13	2.81	87.06	100	10.63	4.10	85.27	100	17.89	8.12	73.99	100	22.62	11.37	66.00	100
2000	10.35	2.97	86.68	100	11.05	4.18	84.77	100	18.93	8.46	72.61	100	22.51	11.40	66.08	100
2001	10.76	3.03	86.20	100	11.52	4.61	83.87	100	18.94	8.81	72.25	100	22.89	11.28	65.83	100
2002	11.20	3.36	85.44	100	12.01	4.91	83.09	100	19.05	8.80	72.15	100	21.67	10.86	67.47	100
2003	11.75	3.48	84.76	100	12.44	5.15	82.41	100	19.38	9.24	71.39	100	21.47	11.03	67.50	100
2004	11.48	3.46	85.06	100	11.72	5.31	82.97	100	17.07	8.14	74.79	100	18.20	10.53	71.27	100

Note:

Yr. Year
SC Scheduled Caste
ST Scheduled Tribe
GEN General Castes
T Total

Source: Public Enterprises Survey, Annual Report, Volume 1, Ministry of Heavy Industries and Public Enterprises, 1978-1979, 1988-1989, 1989-1990, 1990-1991, and 1991-1993 to 2004-2005, New Delhi.

Table 3. Percentage Share of the Social Groups to the Total Employees in Public Sector Banks by Categories

	Officers				Clerks				Sub-Staffs			
Yr.	**SC**	**ST**	**GEN**	**T**	**SC**	**ST**	**GEN**	**T**	**SC**	**ST**	**GEN**	**T**
1978	2.04	0.17	97.79	100	10.32	1.82	87.86	100	16.25	2.09	81.67	100
1979	3.03	0.59	96.38	100	12.13	1.98	85.89	100	21.14	2.95	75.91	100
1980	3.09	0.65	96.26	100	11.93	2.24	85.82	100	20.06	3.09	76.85	100
1981	3.87	0.88	95.25	100	12.57	2.38	85.05	100	17.57	3.55	78.89	100
1982	4.64	1.07	94.30	100	12.96	2.75	84.29	100	22.42	4.33	73.25	100
1983	4.87	1.28	93.85	100	13.48	2.95	83.57	100	23.15	3.97	72.88	100
1984	5.72	1.48	92.80	100	13.83	3.41	82.76	100	23.79	4.32	71.89	100
1985	6.90	1.76	91.34	100	14.04	3.75	82.20	100	24.77	4.43	70.79	100
1986	7.30	1.85	90.86	100	13.78	3.78	82.44	100	24.88	4.50	70.62	100
1988	8.32	2.20	89.48	100	13.87	3.92	82.21	100	21.01	4.74	74.25	100
1989	8.82	2.47	88.71	100	14.03	4.27	81.70	100	21.41	5.61	72.99	100
1990	9.18	2.71	88.11	100	14.22	4.46	81.32	100	21.84	5.68	72.48	100
1991	9.56	3.00	87.45	100	14.19	4.50	81.31	100	21.83	5.74	72.43	100
1992	11.13	3.12	85.75	100	14.32	4.56	81.12	100	21.98	5.80	72.22	100
1993	9.87	3.12	87.01	100	14.37	4.55	81.08	100	22.96	5.87	71.17	100
1994	10.25	3.35	86.41	100	14.45	4.57	80.98	100	23.30	5.84	70.86	100
1995	10.71	3.52	85.77	100	14.53	4.64	80.83	100	22.37	5.84	71.79	100
1996	11.11	3.65	85.24	100	14.69	4.71	80.61	100	23.01	5.96	71.03	100
1997	11.47	3.85	84.67	100	14.83	4.71	80.46	100	23.46	6.17	70.37	100
1998	11.88	4.01	84.11	100	15.01	4.81	80.18	100	23.25	6.16	70.59	100
1999	10.55	4.09	85.36	100	14.92	4.84	80.23	100	22.24	6.20	71.56	100
2000	12.51	4.22	83.27	100	14.88	4.76	80.36	100	24.47	6.25	69.28	100
2001	13.04	4.31	82.65	100	15.17	4.81	80.02	100	24.80	6.43	68.77	100
2002	14.41	5.10	80.49	100	15.90	5.10	79.00	100	25.72	6.43	67.85	100
2004	14.98	5.88	79.14	100	16.16	5.08	78.76	100	25.38	7.02	67.60	100

Note:

Yr.	Year
SC	Scheduled Caste
ST	Scheduled Tribe
GEN	General Castes
T	Total

Source: Annual Report, Ministry of Finance, Government of India, 1978 to 2004-2005.

Table 4. Percentage Share of Social Groups to Total Employees in Public Sector Insurance Companies by Categories

	Group A				Group B				Group C				Group D			
Yr.	SC	ST	GEN	T	SC	ST	GEN	T	SC	ST	GEN	T	SC	ST	GEN	T
1993	8.59	1.99	89.42	100	11.61	3.45	84.94	100	13.24	5.64	81.12	100	27.09	7.35	65.56	100
1994	9.69	2.48	87.83	100	12.24	3.43	84.32	100	13.84	5.45	80.71	100	56.69	3.33	39.98	100
1995	11.24	2.86	85.89	100	12.74	3.64	83.61	100	14.68	5.87	79.45	100	59.61	4.44	35.95	100
1996	12.82	3.39	83.80	100	12.75	3.69	83.56	100	14.50	6.23	79.26	100	73.35	4.57	22.08	100
1997	14.03	4.00	81.97	100	1.36	4.15	94.50	100	15.24	6.63	78.13	100	28.38	7.76	63.86	100
1999	14.65	4.50	80.84	100	13.57	4.17	82.25	100	15.87	7.63	76.50	100	27.27	7.99	64.74	100
2000	14.63	4.56	80.80	100	13.97	4.40	81.63	100	16.46	7.33	76.20	100	25.96	8.47	65.56	100

Note:

Yr. Year
SC Scheduled Caste
ST Scheduled Tribe
GEN General Castes
T Total

Source: Annual Report, Ministry of Finance, Government of India, 1992 to 2004-2005.

Select Bibliography

1. Hills John, Julian Le Grand, and David Piachaud (eds.), *Understanding Social Exclusion*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

2. Sen, Amartya, *Social Exclusion – Concept, Application, and Scrutiny*, Social Development Papers No. 1, Office of Environment and Social Development, Manila: Asian Development Bank, June 2000.

3. Barry, Brian, *Social Exclusion, Social Isolation and the Distribution of Income* in Hills John, Julian Le Grand, and David Piachaud (eds.), *Understanding Social Exclusion*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

4. Kabeer, Naila, *Social Exclusion, Poverty and Discrimination: Towards an Analytical Framework*, IDS Bulletin Volume 31, Number 4, University of Sussex, United Kingdom, October 2000, pp. 83-97.

5. Byrne, David, *Social Exclusion*, Open University Press, United Kingdom, 2005.

6. Saith, Ruhi, *Social Exclusion: The Concept and Application to Developing Countrie*s, QEH Working Paper Series Number 72, Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford, United Kingdom, May 2001.

7. Lenoir, René, *Les Exclus – Un Français sur dix*, Paris: Seuil, 1974.

8. Silver, Hilary, *Reconceptualizing Social Disadvantge: Three Paradigms of Social Exclusion* in Gerry Rodgers, Charles Gore, and Jose Figueiredo (eds.), *Social Exclusion: Rhetoric, Reality, Responses*, International Institute for Labour Studies, Geneva, 1995.

9. Smith, Adam (first published 1776), *The Wealth of Nations*, Bantam Classics, republished 2003.

10. Townsend, Peter, *Poverty in the United Kingdom – A Survey of Household Resources and Standards of Living*, London: Penguin Books and Allen Lane, 1979.

11. De Haan, Arjan, *Social Exclusion: Enriching the Understanding of Deprivation*, Studies in Social and Political Thought, Centre for Social and Political Thought, University of Sussex, United Kingdom, Issue 2, March 2000.

12. Rawls, John, *Distributive Justice* in P. Laslett and W.G. Runciman (eds.), *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, Third Series, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1967.

13. Parkin, Frank, *Marxism and Class Theory – A Bourgeois Critique*, Columbia University Press, USA, Paperback 1983.

14. Murphy, Raymond, *Social Closure – The Theory of Monopolization and Exclusion*, Oxford University Press, USA, 1988.

15. Weber, Max, *Economy and Society – An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, Roth, G. and Wittich, C. (eds.), University of California, Berkeley, 1978.

16. *Reaching Out: An Action Plan on Social Exclusion*, Her Majesty's Government, United Kingdom, September 2006.

17. *World Development Report 2006, Equity and Development*, The World Bank, Washington, D.C., 2005.

18. Political Guidelines laid down by the European Council on Social Exclusion, *Fight against Poverty and Social Exclusion – Definition of Appropriate Objectives*, Brussels, 30th November 2000.

19. Beall, Jo and Piron, Laure-Hélène, *DFID Social Exclusion Review*, London School of Economics and Political Science and Overseas Development Institute, May 2005.

20. *Human Development Report, Inequality and Human Development*, Chapter II, United Nations Development Programme, Oxford University Press, 2005.

21. Daly, Mary, *Social Exclusion as Concept and Policy Template in the European Union*, Working Paper Series 135, Minda de Gunzburg Centre for European Studies, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, 2006.

22. Thorat, Sukhadeo and Senapati, Chittaranjan, *Reservation in Employment, Education and Legislature – Status and Emerging Issues*, Working Paper Series, Volume II Number 05, Indian Institute of Dalit Studies, New Delhi, India, 2007.

Other Sources

23. *Social Exclusion and the MGDs: The Challenge of 'Durable Inequalities' in the Asian Context*, Promoting Growth, Ending Poverty 2015, Session 3: Realizing the Potential for Poverty Reduction, Parallel Group 3 A, Topic 4, Institute of Development Studies and Overseas Development Institute, March 2006.
24. *Social Exclusion: Towards an Holistic Understanding of Deprivation*, Social Development Department, Dissemination Note Number 2, Department for International Development, London: United Kingdom, 1999.
25. Negi, Prashant, Mahamallik, Motilal and Senapati Chittaranjan, *Dalits in India: Search for a Common Destiny*, Sage Publications, New Delhi, India, 2009, Chapter 8, *Employment under Reservations*, pp. 71-84.
26. Negi, Prashant, *Exclusion and Discrimination: Civil Rights Violations and Atrocities in Maharashtra*, Working Paper Series, Volume II Number 02, Indian Institute of Dalit Studies, New Delhi, India, 2007.